



Available at  
**www.ElsevierMathematics.com**  
 POWERED BY SCIENCE @ DIRECT®

Discrete Applied Mathematics 136 (2004) 83–85

DISCRETE  
 APPLIED  
 MATHEMATICS

www.elsevier.com/locate/dam

# A note on Nordhaus–Gaddum inequalities for domination

Shan Erfang<sup>a</sup>, Dang Chuangyin<sup>b</sup>, Kang Liying<sup>a,1</sup>

<sup>a</sup>*Department of Mathematics, Shanghai University, Shanghai 200436, China*

<sup>b</sup>*Department of Manufacturing Engineering and Engineering Management, City University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong*

Received 30 July 2000; received in revised form 19 May 2001; accepted 19 December 2001

## Abstract

For a graph  $G$  of order  $n$ , let  $\gamma(G)$ ,  $\gamma_2(G)$  and  $\gamma_t(G)$  be the domination, double domination and total domination numbers of  $G$ , respectively. The minimum degree of the vertices of  $G$  is denoted by  $\delta(G)$  and the maximum degree by  $\Delta(G)$ . In this note we prove a conjecture due to Harary and Haynes saying that if a graph  $G$  has  $\gamma(G), \gamma(\bar{G}) \geq 4$ , then

$$\gamma_2(G) + \gamma_2(\bar{G}) \leq n - \Delta(G) + \delta(G) - 1 \leq n - 1$$

and

$$\gamma_t(G) + \gamma_t(\bar{G}) \leq n - \Delta(G) + \delta(G) - 1 \leq n - 1,$$

where  $\bar{G}$  is the complement of  $G$ .

© 2003 Elsevier B.V. All rights reserved.

**Keywords:** Domination; Total domination; Double domination

## 1. Introduction

The graphs considered here are finite and simple. Let  $G, \bar{G}$  denote a graph and its complement. The  $V = V(G)$  is the vertex set of  $G$  and  $E = E(G)$  is the edge set of  $G$ . The order  $|V(G)|$  of  $G$  is denoted by  $n$ . The *neighborhood* of a vertex  $v \in V$  is defined as  $N(v) = \{u \in V | uv \in E\}$ . The *close neighborhood* of a vertex  $v$  is  $N[v] = N(v) \cup \{v\}$ . The *degree* of  $v$  is  $d(v) = |N(v)|$ . The maximum degree of a graph  $G$  is denoted by  $\Delta(G)$ .

<sup>1</sup> The Research partially supported by NSFC contract C-10101010.

E-mail address: kangly@online.sh.cn (K. Liying).

and the minimum degree is denoted by  $\delta(G)$ . A vertex in  $G$  is said to dominate itself and all vertices adjacent to it. A set  $S \subseteq V$  is called a *dominating set* if each vertex in  $V - S$  is adjacent to some vertex in  $S$ . The *domination number*  $\gamma(G)$  of a graph  $G$  is the minimum cardinality of a dominating set of  $G$ . If  $S$  is a subset of  $V$ , we use  $\langle S \rangle$  to denote the induced subgraph in  $G$  by  $S$ . For  $v \in V$ , we set  $d_S(v) = |\{u \in S \mid uv \in E\}|$ .

Extensive studies on domination-related topics have been done in the last 30 years. In [4] Harary first introduced the concept of double dominating set. A set  $S \subseteq V$  is called a *double dominating set* for  $G$  if each vertex in  $V$  is dominated by at least two vertices in  $S$ . The *double domination number*, denoted by  $\gamma_2(G)$ , is the smallest size of a double dominating set. More general, Fink and Jacobson [1,2] introduced the concept of  $k$ -domination number. For a positive integer  $k$ , a set  $S$  is called a *k-dominating set* if each vertex in  $V$  is dominated by at least  $k$  vertices in  $S$ . The *k-domination number*, denoted by  $\gamma_k(G)$ , is the minimum cardinality of a  $k$ -dominating set of  $G$ . A *total dominating set* of  $G$  is a subset  $S$  of  $V$  such that each vertex in  $V$  is adjacent to a vertex of  $S$ . The *total domination number*, denoted by  $\gamma_t(G)$ , is the minimum cardinality of a total dominating set.

Let  $u(G)$  be a graph parameter, the calculations of extremum values of  $u(G) + u(\bar{G})$  and  $u(G)u(\bar{G})$  taken over all  $n$ -vertex graphs  $G$  are known as Nordhaus–Gaddum type problems, due to the results of [5]. In this note we prove a conjecture about Nordhaus–Gaddum inequalities for domination.

## 2. Main results

In [3] Harary and Haynes proved the following result and proposed the following conjecture.

**Theorem 1** (Harary and Haynes [3]). *If  $G$  is a graph with  $\gamma(G), \gamma(\bar{G}) \geq 5$ , then*

$$\gamma_2(G) + \gamma_2(\bar{G}) \leq n - \Delta(G) + \delta(G) - 1.$$

**Conjecture** (Harary and Haynes [3]). *If  $G$  is a graph with  $\gamma(G), \gamma(\bar{G}) \geq 4$ , then*

- (1)  $\gamma_2(G) + \gamma_2(\bar{G}) \leq n - \Delta(G) + \delta(G) - 1 \leq n - 1$ ,
- (2)  $\gamma_t(G) + \gamma_t(\bar{G}) \leq n - \Delta(G) + \delta(G) - 1$ .

Our main result below strengthens the conjecture.

**Theorem 2.** *For any integer  $k \geq 1$ , if a graph  $G$  has  $\gamma(G), \gamma(\bar{G}) \geq k + 2$ , then*

$$\gamma_k(G) + \gamma_k(\bar{G}) \leq n - \Delta(G) + \delta(G) - 1.$$

**Proof.** Given  $G$  with  $\gamma(G), \gamma(\bar{G}) \geq k + 2$ , consider an arbitrary pair of vertices  $x$  and  $y$  in  $\bar{G}$ . There exists a set of vertices  $W \subseteq V$  such that  $W$  is not dominated by  $\{x, y\}$  in  $\bar{G}$  and  $(V - W)$  is dominated by  $\{x, y\}$  in  $\bar{G}$ . Let  $W_1$  be a maximum sized independent set for  $\langle W \rangle$  in  $\bar{G}$ , then  $|W_1| \geq \gamma(\bar{G}) - 2 \geq k$ . Otherwise  $\gamma(\bar{G}) \leq |W_1| + 2 < k + 2$ , a

contradiction. Now  $W_1, W_1 \cup \{x\}, W_1 \cup \{y\}$  are independent sets in  $\bar{G}$ . Thus, in  $G$  each pair of vertices must have at least  $\gamma(\bar{G}) - 2 \geq k$  common neighbors. Furthermore, these neighbors are mutually adjacent in  $G$ .

Let  $v$  be a vertex of minimal degree of  $G$ , and  $S = \{u \in V(G) \mid uv \in E(G)\}$ , then  $S$  is a vertex cutset of  $G$ . Let vertices  $x$  and  $y$  be in separate components of  $G - S$ . Hence,  $x$  and  $y$  have at least  $\gamma(\bar{G}) - 2 \geq k$  mutually adjacent common neighbors and these neighbors must be in  $S$ . Then every vertex in  $G - S$  is dominated by at least  $k$  vertices in  $S$ .

Next, we show that every vertex in  $S$  is dominated by at least  $k$  vertices in  $S$ . Assume  $v_1$  is a vertex in  $S$  with  $d_S(v_1) < k - 1$ , then there are at most  $k - 2$  common neighbors for  $v$  and  $v_1$ , this is a contradiction. So  $S$  is a  $k$ -dominating set of  $G$  with size  $\delta(G)$ , thus we have  $\gamma_k(G) \leq \delta(G)$ . Similarly,  $\gamma_k(\bar{G}) \leq \delta(\bar{G}) = n - 1 - \Delta(G)$ . Then  $\gamma_k(G) + \gamma_k(\bar{G}) \leq n - \Delta(G) + \delta(G) - 1 \leq n - 1$ . This completes the proof.  $\square$

The next result is immediate from Theorem 2.

**Corollary 3.** *If a graph  $G$  has  $\gamma(G), \gamma(\bar{G}) \geq 4$ , then*

$$\gamma_2(G) + \gamma_2(\bar{G}) \leq n - \Delta(G) + \delta(G) - 1 \leq n - 1.$$

**Theorem 4.** *If a graph  $G$  has  $\gamma(G), \gamma(\bar{G}) \geq 3$ , then*

$$\gamma_t(G) + \gamma_t(\bar{G}) \leq n - \Delta(G) + \delta(G) - 1.$$

**Proof.** Given  $G$  with  $\gamma(G), \gamma(\bar{G}) \geq 3$ , choose a vertex  $v$  of  $G$  such that  $d(v) = \delta(G)$ . Suppose  $x$  is another vertex of  $G$ , and let  $S$  be the set of vertices adjacent to both  $v$  and  $x$  in  $G$ . For any vertex  $w$  of  $V(\bar{G}) - \{v, x\}$ , if  $vw \notin E(\bar{G})$  and  $xw \notin E(\bar{G})$ , then  $w \in S$ . So  $\{v, x\} \cup S$  is a dominating set of  $\bar{G}$ . This implies  $|\{v, x\} \cup S| \geq \gamma(\bar{G}) \geq 3$ ; and so  $|S| \geq 1$ . Thus, every vertex in  $V(G) - \{v\}$  is adjacent to some vertex in  $N(v)$ . Therefore,  $N(v)$  is a total dominating set of  $G$ , and we have  $\gamma_t(G) \leq |N(v)| = d(v) = \delta(G)$ . Similarly,  $\gamma_t(\bar{G}) \leq \delta(\bar{G}) = n - 1 - \Delta(G)$ . The result follows.  $\square$

## References

- [1] J.F. Fink, M.S. Jacobson, On  $n$ -domination,  $n$ -dependence and forbidden subgraphs, in: Y. Alarvi, et al., (Eds.), Graph Theory With Applications to Algorithms and Computer Science, Wiley, New York, 1985, pp. 301–311.
- [2] J.F. Fink, M.S. Jacobson,  $n$ -Domination in graphs, in: Y. Alavi, et al., (Eds.), Graph Theory with Applications to Algorithms and Computer Science, Wiley, New York, 1985, pp. 283–300.
- [3] F. Harary, T.W. Haynes, Nordhaus–Gaddum inequalities for domination in graphs, Discrete Math. 155 (1996) 99–105.
- [4] F. Harary, T.W. Haynes, Double domination in graphs, Ars Combin. 55 (2000) 201–213.
- [5] E.A. Nordhaus, J.W. Gaddum, On complementary graphs, Amer. Math. Monthly 63 (1956) 175–177.